

## REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of November 20, 2005 is respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, a portion of the substitute specification filed February 16, 2005 has been amended as indicated above in order to provide antecedent basis for new claim language. However, it is submitted that this change is fully supported by the original disclosure, and no new matter has been added. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendment to the substitute specification.

In view of the Amendment filed February 16, 2005, claims 5-14 were pending and examined in the outstanding Office Action. In this regard, the Examiner rejected independent claim 5 and dependent claims 6, 9, and 10 as being anticipated by the Ono reference (JP 409116709A); rejected claim 7 as being unpatentable over the Ono reference in view of the Tsai reference (US 6,084,691); and rejected claims 8 and 11-14 as being unpatentable over the Ono reference in view of "well-known prior art." However, independent claim 5 has now been amended as indicated above, and new dependent claim 15 has been added. For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 5 and the claims that depend therefrom are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Previously-presented independent claim 5 recited that the handy scanner comprises a relay box having a *recess for receiving a handy scanner body* so as to protect the bottom surface of the handy scanner body. Amended independent claim 5 now also recites that the handy scanner body includes a reading section on a narrow bottom surface thereof, and the handy scanner body is operable to allow manual scanning of a manuscript using the reading section so as to perform read-in of the manuscript.

A discussion of the arrangement and advantages of the handy scanner as recited in amended independent claim 5 will now be provided below with reference to various portions of the present application. However, reference to any specific embodiments set forth in the present application is provided only for illustrative purposes, and is not intended to otherwise limit the scope of the claims to those specific embodiments.

As clearly illustrated in Figure 1 of the application, the relay box 1 has a *recess* 4 for receiving the handy scanner body 2 (see Figure 2). As explained on page 7, lines 16-23 of the original specification, because the handy scanner body is *received within the recess* of the relay box when the handy scanner body is not being used, the reading section on the narrow bottom surface of the handy scanner body is protected from dirt or scratches. Furthermore, the recess for receiving the handy scanner body also allows the handy scanner to be easily carried in an integrated manner.

Furthermore, as illustrated in Figure 1, the handy scanner body 2 has a narrow bottom surface where the reading section is located. This enables the handy scanner body to allow manual scanning of the manuscript using the reading section on the narrow bottom surface to thereby perform read-in of the manuscript (see page 5, line 23 through page 6, line 15 of the original specification).

The Ono reference discloses an image reading device including an image pick up part case 6 and a case 12. As illustrated in the elevation view of Figure 1, a transparent acrylic plate 14c defines the upper surface of the case 12 (i.e., defines the surface of case 12 closest to the image pick up part case 6). As shown in Figures 1 and 2, a positioning projecting part 14b is located at each of the four corners of the transparent acrylic plate 14c.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the Ono reference discloses “a relay box (case 12) having a recess (plate 14a) for receiving said handy scanner body (image pick up section 6).” However, as noted above and apparently acknowledged by the Examiner, reference number 14c designates a *transparent acrylic plate*, and does not designate a *recess*. In contrast to the Examiner’s assertion, the case 12 of the Ono reference does not have a recess. Moreover, as clearly illustrated in the elevation view of Figure 1, although a bottom surface of the image pick up part case 6 receives the positioning projecting parts 14b, no portion of the image pick up part case 6 is received in the case 12. In other words, the Ono reference clearly does not disclose or even suggest a relay box having a *recess for receiving the handy scanner body*, as recited in independent claim 5.

Furthermore, as illustrated in Figure 2, the image pick up part case 6 of the Ono reference (corresponding to the handy scanner body 6 according to the Examiner's interpretation) has a generally cube-shaped bottom surface. Therefore, the Ono reference also does not disclose or suggest a handy scanner body including a reading section on a *narrow* bottom surface. Finally, as also illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, the image pick up part case 6 is located above the transparent acrylic plate 14c of the case 12 so as to allow photoelectric conversion of an entire manuscript placed on the transparent acrylic plate 14c without being manually moved. Thus, it is submitted that the Ono reference also does not disclose or suggest that the handy scanner body is operable to allow manual scanning of a manuscript using the reading section so as to perform read-in of the manuscript.

The Tsai reference discloses a multi-purpose scanner integrated into a computer, and the Examiner asserted that the Tsai reference discloses a housing to reduce electrode magnetic interference to the scanning engine. However, the Tsai reference also does not disclose or suggest a relay box having a recess, or a handy scanner body with a narrow bottom surface and operable to allow manual scanning of a manuscript as recited in amended independent claim 5. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated by the Tsai reference to modify the Ono reference so as to obtain the invention recited in amended independent claim 5. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 5 and the claims that depend therefrom are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

The Examiner's attention is also directed to new dependent claim 15, which recites subject matter that further distinguishes the present invention from the prior art.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Tamotsu SENDA

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm

Registration No. 44,142

Attorney for Applicant

WDH/ck  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
February 9, 2006